

**Response**

Applicants, through their attorney, respectfully request the Examiner to consider the application in view of the included amendments and remarks.

**Support**

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 23 by removing the term “fuel” from the specified list of functional fluids. Support for these amendments comes from the claims themselves.

Applicants have amended claim 1 by adding each of the limitations of claims 5 and 9. Support for these amendments comes from the claims themselves as well as the specification. Claims 5 and 9 are now cancelled.

Applicants have amended claim 6 to specify that the methods of the present invention may use an additional indicator in combination with the indicator described in claim 1. Claim 6 also lists the type of indicators that may be used in combination with the indicator described in claim 1. Support for this amendment is found in the claims and also on page 8, lines 16-20, where the different general types of indicators are listed and where it is stated that combinations of indicators may be used.

Applicants have amended claims 7 and 8 so that they now depend on claim 6. Also, claim 7 now specifies that the additional indicators it lists for use in combination with the indicators described in claim 1 are acid/base indicators, while claim 8 specifies its additional indicators are metal indicators. Support for these amendments are found in the claims and also on page 9, lines 15-29 of the specification and on page 10, lines 1-15 of the specification.

No other elements of the claims have been changed.

**Remarks**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. The Examiner objected to the term “fuel” in claims 1 and 23 and suggests removing the term. Applicants have amended the claims as the Examiner suggested and ask that the §112 rejection be removed.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Becket (US 5,710,372). The Examiner also rejected claims 1-8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becket. These rejections are moot in view of the amendments described above.

The Examiner indicated in item 6 of the current office action that claims 23 and 24 would be allowable if the §112 issue were resolved. The Examiner stated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

As noted above, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to address the §112 rejection. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit claims 23 and 24 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 depends on claim 5, which depends on claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 1 to include all of the limitations of claim 5 and claim 9. Thus claim 1 is now equivalent to claim 9 had it been rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 includes each of the limitations that were present in claim 9. Therefore Applicants submit that claim 1, and all claims that depend on it, are allowable per the current office action.

#### Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons it is submitted that the present claims are novel and unobvious over the cited reference, and in condition for allowance. The foregoing remarks are believed to be a full and complete response to the outstanding office action. Therefore an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that only minor issues remain to be resolved, a telephone call to the Undersigned is suggested.

Any required fees or any deficiency or overpayment in fees should be charged or credited to deposit account 12-2275 (The Lubrizol Corporation).

Respectfully submitted,  
THE LUBRIZOL CORPORATION

/Christopher D. Hilker #58,510/

Christopher D. Hilker  
Registration No. 58,510  
Attorney for Applicants

29400 Lakeland Blvd.  
Wickliffe, Ohio 44092-2298  
Telephone: 440-347-4231  
Facsimile: 440-347-1110  
E-mail: [chris.hilker@lubrizol.com](mailto:chris.hilker@lubrizol.com)